

## **Remarks**

Claims 1-20 currently stand rejected. Claims 1, 17, 18 and 20 are amended herein. Claim 8 is canceled herein; thus, claims 1-7 and 9-20 remain pending. The Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection and requests allowance of claims 1-7 and 9-20.

### **Claim Amendments**

Claim 1 is amended to further provide for “analyzing the one or more text strings to produce a human interpretable statement summarizing at least one of the events associated with the one or more text strings.” Also, the previous limitations indicating that the text strings are output, and that each of the events includes system information and context sensitive information, has been deleted.

Claim 18 is amended in a similar fashion to claim 1, with the analysis being performed within a plurality of analyzers.

Substantially all of the subject matter of claim 8 is incorporated into amended claim 1. Accordingly, claim 8 is canceled herein.

Claims 1 and 18 are further amended to delete the phrase “of the type” included therein.

Claims 17 and 20 are amended to include a plurality of analyzers, wherein each of the analyzers is associated with one or more of the entities.

### **Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. (Page 2 of the Office action.) More specifically, no antecedent basis is provided for the term “the type” in claim 1. (Id.) The same problem may also be found in claim 18.

In response, claims 1 and 18 are amended to delete the phrase “of the type.” In light of these amendments, the Assignee asserts that claims 1-20 are now allowable in view of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and respectfully requests withdrawal of that rejection.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,598,179 to Chirashnya et al. (hereinafter “Chirashnya”). (Page 3 of the Office action.) Claims 5 and 10-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chirashnya in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,269,398 to Leong et al. (hereinafter “Leong”). (Page 6 of the Office action.) The Assignee respectfully traverses the rejections in view of the current amendments to claims 1 and 18, and in light of the following discussion.

Independent method claim 1 is reproduced below for convenience, with emphasis supplied:

1. A method for processing events from electronic architecture, the architecture having a plurality of entities generating the events, comprising the steps of:
  - extracting the events from the architecture;
  - separating the events according to the entities;
  - transforming the events to one or more text strings; and
  - analyzing the one or more text strings to produce a human interpretable statement summarizing at least one of the events associated with the one or more text strings.*

Independent system claim 18 incorporates similar provisions.

Generally, Chirashnya discloses an error log analyzer (ELA) which “scans error logs generated by a computer system.” (Column 2, lines 6-8.) The ELA processes the error log data in three stages: (1) a selection stage (selecting errors which are “of relevance to fault conditions of interest”); (2) a filtering stage (filtering and combining the errors into events known to be associated with particular fault conditions); and (3) an analysis stage (checking the events to decide whether a fault exists that requires service attention). (Column 2, lines 15-29.)

With respect to former claim 8, the Office action indicates that Chirashnya teaches analyzing the text strings and producing a human interpretable statement summarizing at least one of the events associated with the one or more text strings, specifically at column 12, lines 5-20. (Page 4 of the Office action.) The Assignee respectfully disagrees. Instead, Chirashnya discloses a Results Table 42 (shown in Fig. 1), wherein each line of the table holds a result *number*, a corresponding message *number*, and a *Boolean indicator* as to whether a field-replaceable unit (FRU) should be reported. (See Table IV at column 12, lines 5-15.) A separate message catalog holds the messages to be provided to the user, wherein each message is

associated with one or more of the result numbers of the Results Table. (See the “Catalog File Examples” at column 12, lines 17-19.) In other words, *numbers and Boolean values* are used as input to present the messages to the user. Thus, Chirashnya does not teach or suggest *text strings* being analyzed to provide a human interpretable statement, as provided for in claims 1 and 18.

Thus, in light of at least the foregoing reasons, the Assignee contends that amended claims 1 and 18 are allowable in view of Chirashnya, and such indication is respectfully requests.

Claims 2-7 and 9-17 depend from independent claim 1, and claims 19 and 20 depend from independent claim 18, thus incorporating the provisions of their independent claims. Thus, the Assignee asserts that claims 2-7, 9-17, 19 and 20 are allowable for at least the reasons presented above in support of claims 1 and 18, and such indication is respectfully requested.

Further, claims 17 and 20 now disclose a plurality of analyzers, with each analyzer being associated with an entity. Oppositely, throughout Chirashnya, all operations of the selection, filtering, and analysis stages appear to be performed by the (*single*) error log analyzer (ELA) described above. Thus, Chirashnya does not teach or suggest *multiple* analyzers, much less wherein each of the analyzers is associated with one of the entities, as provided for in claims 17 and 20. Thus, the Assignee contends claims 17 and 20 are allowable for at least these additional reasons, and such indication is respectfully requested.

Claim 8 is canceled herein. Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection as it pertains to claim 8 is rendered moot.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, the Assignee respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 rejections of claims 1-20.

### Conclusion

Based on the above remarks, the Assignee submits that claims 1-7 and 9-20 are allowable. Additional reasons in support of patentability exist, but such reasons are omitted in the interests of clarity and brevity. The Assignee thus respectfully requests allowance of claims 1-7 and 9-20.

The Assignee believes no fees are due with respect to this filing. However, should the Office determine additional fees are necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/17/06

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'K. Way', is written over a horizontal line.

**SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER**

Kyle J. Way, Reg. No. 45,549

Setter Roche LLP

Telephone: (720) 562-2283

E-mail: kyle@setterroche.com

**Correspondence address:**

**CUSTOMER NO. 022879**

**HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY**

Intellectual Property Administration

P.O. Box 272400

Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400